arXiv:1603.05801v1 [physics.optics] 18 Mar 2016

Differential description and irreversibility of depolarizing light-matter interactions

Julien Fade* and Noé Ortega-Quijano
Institut de Physique de Rennes, CNRS, Université de Rennes 1, Campus de Beaulieu, 35 042 Rennes, France
(Dated: March 21, 2016)

The widely-used Jones and Mueller differential polarization calculi allow non-depolarizing deterministic polarization interactions, known to be elements of the $SO^+(1,3)$ Lorentz group, to be described in an efficient way. In this Letter, a stochastic differential Jones formalism is shown to provide a clear physical insight on light depolarization, which arises from the interaction of polarized light with a random medium showing fluctuating anisotropic properties. Based on this formalism, several *intrinsic* depolarization metrics naturally arise to efficiently characterize light depolarization in a medium, and an irreversibility property of depolarizing transformations is finally established.

PACS numbers: 42.25.Ja; 42.25.Bs; 78.20.Bh; 89.70.Cf; 02.20.Sv

In the field of polarimetry, Jones and Stokes/Mueller formalisms have always appeared as dual and often exclusive approaches, whose specific characteristics have been exploited for diverse applications. On the one hand, the description of field coherence in the Jones calculus, which relates the input and output 2-dimensional complex electric field through $\mathbf{E}_{out} = \underline{\mathrm{J}}\mathbf{E}_{in}$, justifies its use in ellipsometry [1, 2], optical design [3–6], spectroscopy [6], astronomy [7] or radar (PolSar) [8]. On the other hand, Mueller calculus is widely used in biophotonics [9, 10], material characterization [11, 12] or teledetection [13], as it is based on optical field observables (intensity measurements), relating the input and output 4-dimensional real Stokes vector through $\mathbf{s}_{out} = \underline{\mathrm{M}}\mathbf{s}_{in}$. As a consequence, these approaches fundamentally differ in their capacity to characterize depolarizing light-matter interactions (i.e., non-deterministic polarization transformations yielding a partial randomization of the input electric field). As Jones already pointed out in one of his seminal papers [14], Jones matrices are unable to directly describe depolarizing media, which can however be grasped in the Mueller formalism via depolarizing Mueller matrices. This discrepancy between both standpoints takes part in the debate, still topical in the scientific community, about the physical origin of light depolarization in media [15–23]. In this Letter, we show that the differential polarization formalism, which naturally arises from group theory, provides new physical insight on depolarizing light-matter interactions. This approach allows us to define *intrinsic* depolarization metrics, and to demonstrate an irreversibility property for depolarizing transformations, as a counterpart to the well-known invariance property verified by deterministic interactions.

In the specific situation of a deterministic polarization transformation, there is a clear one-to-one relationship (recalled in Fig. 1) between a 2×2 complex Jones matrix $\underline{\mathrm{J}}$ and the corresponding 4×4 real-valued non-depolarizing Mueller-Jones matrix $\underline{\mathrm{M}}_{nd}$ [24, 25]. Interestingly, when one considers normalized unit-determinant matrices, both descriptions appear to be isomorphic representations of the same 6-dimensional group, namely the proper orthochronous Lorentz group $SO^+(1,3)$ for unit-determinant Mueller matrices $\underline{\widetilde{\mathrm{M}}}_{nd}$ and the special linear group $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ for unit-determinant Jones matrices $\underline{\widetilde{\mathrm{J}}}$ [26, 27]. As a result, there is a well-known analogy between deterministic polarization transformations and special relativity [27–33], as non-depolarizing interactions correspond to Lorentz transformations, and must therefore preserve the Minkowski metric (defined as $||\mathbf{s}||^2_{1,3} = \mathbf{s}^T G \mathbf{s}$, with $G = \mathrm{diag}[1,-1,-1,-1]$) of the input Stokes vector $\mathbf{s}_{in}$ [30]. Interestingly, this invariance property can be related to the preservation of the Shannon entropy of the field, under the assumption of complex Gaussian circular fluctuations [34], as $H(\mathbf{s}) = -\int P_{\mathbf{E}}(\mathbf{E}) \ln P_{\mathbf{E}}(\mathbf{E}) = \ln \pi^2 e^2 ||\mathbf{s}||^2_{1,3}/4$. As pointed out in [33], such an invariance property is neither verified by the intensity of the light , $I = s_0$, nor by its degree of polarization, $\mathcal{P} = \sqrt{s_1^2 + s_2^2 + s_3^2}/s_0$.



FIG. 1. (a) Commutative diagram linking differential and macroscopic Jones and (non-depolarizing) Mueller matrices, with $A = \left[\mathrm{vec}(\underline{\sigma}_0)\ \mathrm{vec}(\underline{\sigma}_1)\ \mathrm{vec}(\underline{\sigma}_2)\ \mathrm{vec}(\underline{\sigma}_3)\right]^T/\sqrt{2}$ and $A^{-1} = A^\dagger$. (b) Definition of Cloude's coherency matrix (CCM). Superscripts $*$, T and $\dagger$ respectively denote complex conjugation, standard and Hermitian matrix transposition.

Historically, Jones [35] and Azzam [36] respectively introduced the so-called *differential* Jones and Mueller

calculi, with a corresponding differential Jones matrix (dJm) $\underline{\mathrm{j}}$ and a differential Mueller matrix (dMm) $\underline{\mathrm{m}}_{nd}$. Both approaches describe the local evolution of a transversally polarized wave along direction $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ through the respective differential equations $d\mathbf{E}/d\hat{\mathbf{n}} = \underline{\mathrm{j}}\,\mathbf{E}$, and $d\mathbf{s}/d\hat{\mathbf{n}} = \underline{\mathrm{m}}\,\mathbf{s}$. According to group theory, these differential descriptions lead to a representation of deterministic polarization transformations (either in group $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ or in $SO^+(1,3)$), by their counterpart in the corresponding Lie algebra, i.e., $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{C})$ for $\underline{\mathrm{j}}$, or $\mathfrak{so}^+(1,3)$ for $\underline{\mathrm{m}}_{nd}$, which verifies Minkowski G-antisymmetry with $\underline{\mathrm{m}}_{nd} + \underline{\mathrm{G}}\,\underline{\mathrm{m}}_{nd}^T\,\underline{\mathrm{G}} = 0$ [37]. There is a clear equivalence between these four representations, which are linked through the commutative diagram represented in Fig. 1, the macroscopic and differential matrices being related by the exponential map ($\underline{\mathrm{J}} = \exp(\underline{\mathrm{j}}\Delta z)$ and $\underline{\mathrm{M}}_{nd} = \exp(\underline{\mathrm{m}}_{nd}\Delta z)$ when propagation over Δz through a homogeneous medium is assumed).

As Lie algebras can be viewed as the tangent spaces to the corresponding Lie groups at the identity element [37, 38], the differential Jones or Mueller formalisms allow polarization properties to be described in a linearized geometry. One of the powerful consequences of such a linearization lies in the simple linear parameterizations of the differential matrices in terms of anisotropic optical properties. Indeed, the dJm $\underline{\mathrm{j}}$ and dMm $\underline{\mathrm{m}}_{nd}$, that both characterize the polarimetric properties of an infinitesimal plane-parallel slab of a deterministic linear optical medium, read

$$\underline{\mathrm{j}} = \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} \kappa_i + \kappa_q - i(2\eta_i + \eta_q) & \kappa_u - \eta_v - i(\eta_u + \kappa_v) \\ \kappa_u + \eta_v - i(\eta_u - \kappa_v) & \kappa_i - \kappa_q - i(2\eta_i - \eta_q) \end{bmatrix}, \tag{1}$$

$$\text{and,} \quad \underline{\mathrm{m}}_{nd} = \begin{bmatrix} \kappa_i & \kappa_q & \kappa_u & \kappa_v \\ \kappa_q & \kappa_i & -\eta_v & \eta_u \\ \kappa_u & \eta_v & \kappa_i & -\eta_q \\ \kappa_v & -\eta_u & \eta_q & \kappa_i \end{bmatrix}. \tag{2}$$

Notations κ and η respectively refer to the real and imaginary part of the propagation constant, which reads $p = \kappa - i\eta$ when the considered monochromatic plane wave is written as $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{E}_0 \exp[-(i\omega t + pz)]$ [35, 39]. In the above matrices describing anisotropic optical media, the isotropic extinction coefficient is denoted κ_i, whereas η_i stands for the isotropic (absolute) optical phase, whose information is lost in the Mueller description [14]. As for the other terms, the subscripts q, u, and v refer to linear x-y, linear $\pm 45°$ and circular *left/right* anisotropy, through $x_{q,u,v} = x_{x,45°,rcp} - x_{y,-45°,lcp}$, for $x = \kappa$ or η.

One can now legitimately question the physical understanding of depolarizing transformations, which entail randomized anisotropic effects on the incident optical wave. Recently, it has been proposed to extend the differential Mueller formalism to the more intricate case of depolarizing transformations, by the introduction of depolarizing dMm's. This approach has permitted a number of interesting results to be obtained on depolarizing transformations [40–48]. We propose below to theoretically justify the recent developments on depolarizing dMms, by using an alternative description involving stochastic differential Jones matrices. For that purpose, let us consider a stochastic differential Jones matrix $\underline{\mathrm{j}} = \underline{\mathrm{j}}_0 + \underline{\Delta\mathrm{j}}$, modeling a random depolarizing local transformation of the field, where $\underline{\mathrm{j}}_0 = \langle \underline{\mathrm{j}} \rangle$ is the deterministic average polarization transformation, whose form has been recalled in Eq.(1), and where the fluctuations matrix verifies $\langle \underline{\Delta\mathrm{j}} \rangle = 0$. Assuming infinitesimal propagation over Δz, the Jones matrix for such a transformation can be written $\underline{\mathrm{J}} = \exp(\underline{\mathrm{j}}\Delta z) \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Id}} + \underline{\mathrm{j}}\Delta z$ at first order in Δz. From Eq. (1), this relation can be conveniently rewritten in a vector form in the Pauli matrices basis $\{\sigma_i\}_{i=\{0,3\}}$ as $\mathbf{V}_\mathrm{J} \simeq \left[1 + \frac{\Delta z}{2} p^{(0)} \quad \frac{\Delta z}{2}\mathbf{p}^\dagger\right]^T$, with $p^{(0)} = p_0^{(0)} + \Delta p^{(0)}$, $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{p}_0 + \Delta\mathbf{p}$, and where

$$p_0^{(0)} = \kappa_i - 2\eta_i, \text{ and } \mathbf{p}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} \kappa_q - i\eta_q \\ \kappa_u - i\eta_u \\ \kappa_v - i\eta_v \end{bmatrix}. \tag{3}$$

From $\mathbf{V}_\mathrm{J}$, one can derive the Cloude's coherency matrix (CCM) of the polarimetric transformation, which provides relevant criteria to assess the physical realizability of macroscopic Mueller matrices [26, 49], by calculating $\underline{\mathrm{C}}(\mathrm{J}) = \langle \mathbf{V}_\mathrm{J}\mathbf{V}_\mathrm{J}^\dagger \rangle$, which can be decomposed into a sum of two terms $\underline{\mathrm{C}}(\mathrm{J}) = \underline{\mathrm{C}}_{nd} + \underline{\mathrm{C}}_d$, where $\underline{\mathrm{C}}_{nd} = \mathbf{V}_{\mathrm{J}_0}\mathbf{V}_{\mathrm{J}_0}^\dagger$ with $\mathbf{V}_{\mathrm{J}_0} \simeq \left[1 + \frac{\Delta z}{2} p_0^{(0)} \quad \frac{\Delta z}{2}\mathbf{p}_0^\dagger\right]^T$, and where

$$\underline{\mathrm{C}}_d = \frac{(\Delta z)^2}{4}\begin{bmatrix} c_0 & \mathbf{c}^\dagger \\ \mathbf{c} & \underline{\mathcal{C}} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{4}$$

with $c_0 = \langle |\Delta p^{(0)}|^2 \rangle$, $\mathbf{c} = \langle \Delta p^{(0)*} \Delta\mathbf{p} \rangle$ and the 3×3 matrix $\underline{\mathcal{C}} = \langle \Delta\mathbf{p}\Delta\mathbf{p}^\dagger \rangle$. From such a decomposition, it is obviously seen that a deterministic transformation, with $\Delta p^{(0)} = 0$ and $\Delta\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{0}$, results in a CCM of rank one ($\underline{\mathrm{C}}_{nd}$ being the matrix of a projector) which is Cloude's condition for a non-depolarizing transformation [26, 49]. Conversely, as soon as $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ is a non-null matrix, the rank of $\underline{\mathrm{C}}(\mathrm{J})$ is greater than one, hence the corresponding transformation is depolarizing according to Cloude's criterion [26, 49]. As a result, the depolarizing nature of a transformation appears to be completely comprehended by the 3×3 positive semi-definite Hermitian submatrix $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$, i.e., by 9 independent real parameters. As will be seen below, this matrix allows one to define interesting *intrinsic* depolarization metrics of the medium.

It is now quite straightforward to identify these terms with the CCM of, respectively, the non-depolarizing and the depolarizing dMm's that have been introduced in earlier works [50–52]. Indeed, in the dMm formalism, the Mueller matrix for the considered local transformation reads $\underline{\mathrm{M}} = \exp(\underline{\mathrm{m}}\Delta z) \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Id}} + \underline{\mathrm{m}}\Delta z$ at first order in Δz. As suggested in [52], the dMm $\underline{\mathrm{m}}$ can be decomposed into a G-antisymmetric part, namely $\underline{\mathrm{m}}_{nd}$ given in Eq. (2),

and a G-symmetric part $\underline{\mathrm{m}}'_d$ which corresponds to the depolarizing contribution. With such a decomposition, it can be checked that the 3×3 lower-right submatrix of the CMM of $\underline{\mathrm{M}}$ is only due to the G-symmetric (depolarizing) part of $\underline{\mathrm{m}}$. As a result, since Eq. (4) indicates that this submatrix must have a quadratic behavior in Δz, the parameterization of the dMm must be written $\underline{\mathrm{m}} = \underline{\mathrm{m}}_{nd} + \underline{\mathrm{m}}'_d = \underline{\mathrm{m}}_{nd} + \underline{\mathrm{m}}_d\Delta z$, with the 9-parameters G-symmetric part reading [50–52]

$$\underline{\mathrm{m}}_d = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & d_{\kappa_q} & d_{\kappa_u} & d_{\kappa_v} \\ -d_{\kappa_q} & -d_{\mu_q} & d_{\eta_v} & d_{\eta_u} \\ -d_{\kappa_u} & d_{\eta_v} & -d_{\mu_u} & d_{\eta_q} \\ -d_{\kappa_v} & d_{\eta_u} & d_{\eta_q} & -d_{\mu_v} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{5}$$

The proposed decomposition of $\underline{\mathrm{m}}$ has an important physical meaning: the depolarization properties of a sample must pile up quadratically with Δz, whereas deterministic anisotropy parameters classically evolve linearly with the propagation distance. Such a decomposition has been recently proposed in [53], but without a clear physical justification that is brought by the approach presented in this Letter. This interesting property of depolarization in samples has been recently verified experimentally on controlled test samples [48], and it may have crucial implications in the analysis of depolarizing media in experimental polarimetry [2, 54].

With such a parameterization, the CMM of $\underline{\mathrm{M}} \simeq \underline{\mathrm{Id}} + \underline{\mathrm{m}}\Delta z$ is obtained using the relationship recalled in Fig. 1, yielding $\underline{\mathrm{C}}(\mathrm{M}) = \begin{bmatrix} 1+\kappa_i\Delta z & \frac{\Delta z}{2}\mathbf{p}_0^\dagger \\ \frac{\Delta z}{2}\mathbf{p}_0 & \left(\frac{\Delta z}{2}\right)^2\underline{\Sigma} \end{bmatrix}$, with

$$\underline{\Sigma} = 2\begin{bmatrix} \frac{-d_{\mu_q}+d_{\mu_u}+d_{\mu_v}}{2} & d_{\eta_v}+id_{\kappa_v} & d_{\eta_u}-id_{\kappa_u} \\ d_{\eta_v}-id_{\kappa_v} & \frac{d_{\mu_q}-d_{\mu_u}+d_{\mu_v}}{2} & d_{\eta_q}+id_{\kappa_q} \\ d_{\eta_u}+id_{\kappa_u} & d_{\eta_q}-id_{\kappa_q} & \frac{d_{\mu_q}+d_{\mu_u}-d_{\mu_v}}{2} \end{bmatrix}.$$

It can be observed that $\underline{\mathrm{C}}(\mathrm{M})$ corresponds to an approximation of the CMM obtained above from the Jones formalism, where each element has been truncated to the first non-null term of its Taylor expansion in Δz.

It is now interesting to identify the lower-right 3×3 submatrix $\underline{\Sigma}$ with its previous expression $\underline{\mathcal{C}} = \langle\Delta\mathbf{p}\Delta\mathbf{p}^\dagger\rangle$ found in Eq. (4), yielding the following set of equations:

$$\begin{aligned} 2d_{\mu_{q,u,v}} &= \big\langle[(\Delta\eta)^2+(\Delta\kappa)^2]_{u,v,q} + [(\Delta\eta)^2+(\Delta\kappa)^2]_{v,q,u}\big\rangle, \\ 2d_{\eta_{q,u,v}} &= \big\langle\Delta\kappa_{u,v,q}\Delta\kappa_{v,q,u} + \Delta\eta_{u,v,q}\Delta\eta_{v,q,u}\big\rangle, \\ 2d_{\kappa_{q,u,v}} &= \big\langle\Delta\kappa_{u,v,q}\Delta\eta_{v,q,u} - \Delta\eta_{u,v,q}\Delta\kappa_{v,q,u}\big\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

This clearly shows that the nine depolarization parameters $d_{\mu_{q,u,v}}$, $d_{\eta_{q,u,v}}$ and $d_{\kappa_{q,u,v}}$ of the dMm $\underline{\mathrm{m}}_d$ are physically related to the second-order statistical properties of the anisotropy parameters of the sample. Such an observation was recently reported for the first time in [23] through somewhat intricate calculus using stochastic dMm's. More interestingly, the fact that these nine parameters are related to variance/covariance terms through the above specific relationships is the fundamental origin of the necessary conditions that must be fulfilled by the elements of $\underline{\mathrm{m}}_d$ so that it is physically admissible [45, 53]. These necessary conditions imply that an admissible depolarizing dMm $\underline{\mathrm{m}}_d$ must belong (up to double cosetting by Lorentz transformations) to one of the two canonical forms derived in [55, 56]:

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\mathrm{m}}_d^{(\mathrm{I})} = \mathrm{diag}\big[&d_1+d_2+d_3;\ d_1-d_2-d_3; \\ &-d_1+d_2-d_3;\ -d_1-d_2+d_3\big], \end{aligned} \tag{6a}$$

$$\underline{\mathrm{m}}_d^{(\mathrm{II})} = \begin{bmatrix} d_1+d_2 & d_2 & 0 & 0 \\ -d_2 & d_1-d_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -d_1 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{6b}$$

with the following conditions on the canonical depolarization parameters: $d_i \geq 0$, for $i \in \{1,3\}$.

These previous results evidence the fact that the depolarization properties of a medium at an infinitesimal level are intrinsically described by the matrix $\underline{\Sigma}$ (or equivalently $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$), which contains the 9 depolarization parameters described above. However, standard depolarization metrics are defined either on the macroscopic Mueller matrix of the medium (e.g., depolarization index [57]), or on its CCM (e.g., Cloude entropy [26, 49, 58]). Though often useful, such depolarization metric definitions can nevertheless be unsatisfactory in some situations. Indeed, two samples sharing the same fluctuations properties of their optical parameters (i.e., same matrix $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$) but with distinct principal polarization transformation vector $\mathbf{p}_0$ can have a different depolarization index, or Cloude entropy in the general case. This is due to the fact that the depolarization index is calculated from the whole Mueller matrix, and that the Cloude entropy depends on the four eigenvalues of the CCM, i.e., both metrics simultaneously depend on the deterministic polarization transformation and on the fluctuating parameters.

Contrarily, the new insight brought by the differential Jones and Mueller calculus allows one to naturally define intrinsic depolarization metrics, which only depend on the fluctuations of the anisotropy parameters of the sample. One can first define the *intrinsic differential depolarization metric* as $P_\delta = ||\underline{\Sigma}||_F$, where $||\underline{\mathrm{X}}||_F = \sqrt{\mathrm{tr}[\underline{\mathrm{X}}^\dagger\underline{\mathrm{X}}]}$ denotes the Frobenius matrix norm [46]. Such quantity can vary from 0 (non-depolarizing) to (potentially) infinity and has proven to be efficient in situations where standard approaches fail to correctly describe the depolarizing nature of a sample [46]. In addition, one can further gain a physical insight on the depolarization properties of the sample by analyzing additional quantities on the submatrix Σ. For instance, the determinant of Σ can be interpreted as a *depolarization volume* $\mathcal{V}_{dep} = \det[\underline{\Sigma}]$. This quantity is equal to zero as soon as one polarimetric direction has null

Parameters $d_{i,\ i\in\{1,3\}}$		P_δ^2	$\mathcal{V}_{dep}$	$\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{C})$
(I)	$d_i = d_j = d_k$	$3d_i$	d_i^3	1
	$d_i = d_j \neq d_k$	$2d_i + d_k$	$d_i^4 d_k$	$\frac{\ln 2}{\ln 3} < \mathcal{S} < 1$
	$d_i \neq d_j \neq d_k$	$d_i + d_j + d_k$	$d_i d_j d_k$	$0 < \mathcal{S} < 1$
(I/II)	$d_i = d_j \quad 0$	$2d_i$	0	$\frac{\ln 2}{\ln 3}$
	$d_i \neq d_j \quad 0$	$d_i + d_j$	0	$0 < \mathcal{S} < \frac{\ln 2}{\ln 3}$
	$d_i \quad 0 \quad 0$	d_i^2	0	0

TABLE I. Intrinsic differential depolarization metric, volume and Cloude entropy for the two canonical dMm's of Eq. (6).

fluctuations, indicating perfect correlation between two polarization directions. Another interesting approach is to analyze the Cloude entropy of the submatrix $\underline{\Sigma}$ itself, which can be expressed as a normalized version of the von Neumann entropy by $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma) = -\mathrm{tr}\big[\frac{\underline{\Sigma}}{||\underline{\Sigma}||_1} \log_3 \frac{\underline{\Sigma}}{||\underline{\Sigma}||_1}\big]$, where $||X||_1 = \mathrm{tr}\sqrt{X^\dagger X}$ denotes the Schatten-von Neumann 1-norm (*trace* norm) [59]. The notation $\mathcal{S}$ is used to avoid confusion with the Shannon entropy of the field $H(\mathbf{s})$ defined above. This quantity varies between 0 and 1 and adds interesting information on the distribution of the eigenvalues of $\underline{\Sigma}$, which informs about depolarization anisotropy. It is interesting to notice that the quantities P_δ, $\mathcal{V}_{dep}$ and $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)$ are defined irrespective of the propagation distance, and are invariant by deterministic unitary transformations, thus justifying their qualification as intrinsic metrics. This has the strong physical meaning that the sample must keep the same depolarization properties whatever be its deterministic anisotropic properties. Moreover, combining these three depolarization parameters provides direct information on the number and degeneracy of non-null canonical parameters, as evidenced in Table I. Such a procedure, which does not require reducing $\underline{\mathrm{m}}_d$ to its canonical form, also allows one to identify type-(I) canonical family when all three canonical parameters are non-null.

These considerations provide a fundamental insight on the origin of depolarization as a randomization of light polarization due to the second-order statistical fluctuations of the anisotropy parameters of the medium, giving access to meaningful intrinsic depolarization metrics. Lastly, they allow us to demonstrate an irreversibility property of depolarizing light-matter interactions:

Property 1 *For any admissible fully or partially polarized input Stokes vector* $\mathbf{s}_{in}$*, a physically realizable depolarizing non-singular and unit determinant Mueller matrix* $\widetilde{\underline{\mathrm{M}}}$ *verifies* $||\mathbf{s}_{out}||_{1,3}^2 = ||\widetilde{\underline{\mathrm{M}}}\,\mathbf{s}_{in}||_{1,3}^2 \geq ||\mathbf{s}_{in}||_{1,3}^2$.

The demonstration of this property in the general case of standard Mueller matrices has never been reported to our best knowledge, and is provided in a more general form as Supplemental Material [60]. For the sake of conciseness, we provide the demonstration of the equivalent property for a depolarizing dMm $\underline{\mathrm{m}} = \underline{\mathrm{m}}_{nd} + \underline{\mathrm{m}}'_d$ with null trace



FIG. 2. Effect of a non-depolarizing ($\widetilde{M}_{nd}$) or a depolarizing ($\widetilde{M}_d$) transformation on (a) the standard degree of polarization $\mathcal{P}$, and (b) the Minkowski metric $||\mathbf{s}||_{1,3}$ or Shannon entropy $H(\mathbf{s})$, for all possible input Stokes vectors $\mathbf{s}_{in}$, schematically represented around a chromatic disk.

($\kappa_i = 0$), i.e., for any physical Stokes vector,

$$\frac{d||\mathbf{s}||_{1,3}^2}{dz} = \mathbf{s}^T\big[\underline{\mathrm{m}}'^T_d\,\underline{\mathrm{G}} + \underline{\mathrm{G}}\,\underline{\mathrm{m}}'_d\big]\mathbf{s} \geq 0, \tag{7}$$

with equality if and only if the dMm is non depolarizing ($\underline{\mathrm{m}}'_d = 0$). The above expression is easily obtained by first order Taylor expansion of $||\mathbf{s}(z+\Delta z)||_{1,3}^2 = ||(\underline{\mathrm{Id}} + \underline{\mathrm{m}}\Delta z)\mathbf{s}(z)||_{1,3}^2$ and by the G-antisymmetry of $\underline{\mathrm{m}}_{nd}$ when $\kappa_i = 0$. The positivity can then be easily shown on the two canonical forms of $\underline{\mathrm{m}}'_d$ recalled above. One indeed has $d||\mathbf{s}||_{1,3}^2/dz = \Delta z[2s_0^2(d_1+d_2+d_3) - s_1^2(d_1 - d_2 - d_3) - s_2^2(d_2 - d_3 - d_1) - s_3^2(d_3 - d_1 - d_2)]$ for type-(I) depolarizing dMm, whereas, for type-(II), $d||\mathbf{s}||_{1,3}^2/dz = \Delta z[2d_2(s_0^2+s_1^2) + d_1(s_0^2 - s_1^2 + s_2^2 + s_3^2)]$. These two quantities are obviously non negative under the physicality conditions recalled above (i.e., $\forall i \in \{1,3\},\ d_i \geq 0$) and for admissible Stokes vectors (i.e., $||\mathbf{s}||_{1,3} \geq 0$).

Property 1 has a strong physical meaning since it reveals the irreversible effect of a depolarizing transformation on the propagating field, which clearly appears through the necessary increase of the Minkowski metric of its Stokes vector. Interestingly, this irreversibility property has an *informational/thermodynamical* counterpart. Indeed, from Eq. (7), the Shannon entropy of the bidimensional electrical field vector can be shown to obey an irreversible evolution with depolarizing transformations, as $\frac{dH(\mathbf{s})}{dz} = \frac{2}{||\mathbf{s}||_{1,3}}\frac{d||\mathbf{s}||_{1,3}}{dz} \geq 0$. Such an irreversible behavior of the Minkowski metric $||\mathbf{s}||_{1,3}$, or alternatively the Shannon entropy $H(\mathbf{s})$, confirms that these quantities are best adapted to describe the polarimetric *randomization* (depolarization) of a propagating beam. Contrarily to the field intensity or the standard degree of polarization $\mathcal{P}$, these quantities are preserved through non-singular deterministic (and reversible) transformations, and must necessarily grow with irreversible depolarizing transformations. This is schematically illustrated in Fig. 2.

As a conclusion, the differential Jones formalism has allowed us to provide a clear intrinsic physical picture of the origins of light depolarization in a medium, as well as physically meaningful implication regarding an irreversibility property of the beam entropy under depolarizing transformations.

* julien.fade@univ-rennes1.fr

[1] R. M. Azzam and N. M. Bashara, *Ellipsometry and polarized light* (Elsevier, 1987).
[2] J. Weber, V. Calado, and M. Van de Sanden, Applied Physics Letters **97** (2010).
[3] R. A. Chipman, Optical Engineering **28**, 280290 (1989).
[4] I. P. Kaminow, IEEE Journal of Quantum Electronics **17**, 15 (1981).
[5] E. Collett, *Polarized light: fundamentals and applications* (Dekker, 1993).
[6] D. S. Kliger and J. W. Lewis, *Polarized light in optics and spectroscopy* (Elsevier, 2012).
[7] D. Coulson, R. G. Crittenden, and N. G. Turok, Physical Review Letters **73**, 2390 (1994).
[8] J.-S. Lee and E. Pottier, *Polarimetric radar imaging: from basics to applications* (CRC Press, 2009).
[9] A. Pierangelo, A. Benali, M.-R. Antonelli, T. Novikova, P. Validire, B. Gayet, and A. De Martino, Optics Express **19**, 1582 (2011).
[10] S. Alali and A. Vitkin, Journal of Biomedical Optics **20**, 061104 (2015).
[11] P. Rogers, T. Kang, T. Zhou, M. Kotelyanskii, and A. Sirenko, Thin Solid Films **519**, 2668 (2011).
[12] R. Magnusson, J. Birch, P. Sandström, C.-L. Hsiao, H. Arwin, and K. Järrendahl, Thin Solid Films **571**, 447 (2014).
[13] J. S. Tyo, D. L. Goldstein, D. B. Chenault, and J. A. Shaw, Appl. Opt. **45**, 5453 (2006).
[14] R. C. Jones, J. Opt. Soc. Am. **37**, 107 (1947).
[15] D. Bicout and C. Brosseau, Journal de Physique I **2**, 2047 (1992).
[16] C. Brosseau, *Fundamentals of polarized light - A statistical Optics approach* (John Wiley, 1998).
[17] A. Aiello and J. Woerdman, Physical Review Letters **94**, 090406 (2005).
[18] M. Xu and R. Alfano, Physical Review Letters **95**, 213901 (2005).
[19] T. Setälä, A. Shevchenko, M. Kaivola, and A. T. Friberg, Physical Review A **78**, 033817 (2008).
[20] C. Macias-Romero, M. Foreman, and P. Török, Optics Express **19**, 25066 (2011).
[21] J. Sorrentini, M. Zerrad, G. Soriano, and C. Amra, Opt. Express **19**, 21313 (2011).
[22] L. Pouget, J. Fade, C. Hamel, and M. Alouini, Applied Optics **51**, 7345 (2012).
[23] V. Devlaminck, JOSA A **30**, 2196 (2013).
[24] R. Simon, Optics Communications **42**, 293 (1982).
[25] K. Kim, L. Mandel, and E. Wolf, J. Opt. Soc. Am. A **4**, 433 (1987).
[26] S. Cloude, Optik **75**, 26 (1986).
[27] D. Han, Y. Kim, and M. E. Noz, Physical Review E **56**, 6065 (1997).
[28] P. Pellat-Finet and M. Bausset, Optik **90**, 101 (1992).
[29] J. A. Morales and E. Navarro, Physical Review E **67**, 026605 (2003).
[30] B. Simon, S. Simon, N. Mukunda, F. Gori, M. Santarsiero, R. Borghi, and R. Simon, JOSA A **27**, 188 (2010).
[31] V. Lakshminarayanan, M. L. Calvo, and T. Alieva, *Mathematical Optics: Classical, Quantum, and Computational Methods* (CRC Press, 2012).
[32] T. Tudor, Optics Letters **40**, 693 (2015).
[33] G. R. Franssens, JOSA A **32**, 164 (2015).
[34] P. Réfrégier, F. Goudail, P. Chavel, and A. Friberg, J. Opt. Soc. Am. A **21**, 2124 (2004).
[35] R. C. Jones, J. Opt. Soc. Am. **38**, 671 (1948).
[36] R. Azzam, JOSA **68**, 1756 (1978).
[37] P. Lounesto, *Clifford algebras and spinors* (Cambridge University Press, 2001).
[38] J. Gallier, *Geometric methods and applications: for computer science and engineering* (Springer Science & Business Media, 2011).
[39] R. H. Muller, Surface Science **16**, 14 (1969).
[40] N. Ortega-Quijano, B. Haj-Ibrahim, E. Garcia-Caurel, J. L. Arce-Diego, and R. Ossikovski, Optics Express **20**, 1151 (2012).
[41] S. Kumar, H. Purwar, R. Ossikovski, I. A. Vitkin, and N. Ghosh, Journal of Biomedical Optics **17**, 105006 (2012).
[42] N. Ortega-Quijano, F. Fanjul-Vélez, and J. L. Arce-Diego, Biomedical Optics Express **5**, 287 (2014).
[43] P. G. Ellingsen, L. M. S. Aas, V. S. Hagen, R. Kumar, M. B. Lilledahl, and M. Kildemo, Journal of Biomedical Optics **19**, 026002 (2014).
[44] M. Villiger and B. E. Bouma, Optics Letters **39**, 1779 (2014).
[45] R. Ossikovski and V. Devlaminck, Optics Letters **39**, 1216 (2014).
[46] N. Ortega-Quijano, F. Fanjul-Vélez, and J. L. Arce-Diego, Optics letters **40**, 3280 (2015).
[47] R. Ossikovski and A. De Martino, JOSA A **32**, 343 (2015).
[48] N. Agarwal, J. Yoon, E. Garcia-Caurel, T. Novikova, J.-C. Vanel, A. Pierangelo, A. Bykov, A. Popov, I. Meglinski, and R. Ossikovski, Optics Letters **40**, 5634 (2015).
[49] S. R. Cloude, in *Polarization Considerations for Optical Systems II*, Proc. SPIE, Vol. 1166 (1990) pp. 177–185.
[50] N. Ortega-Quijano and J. L. Arce-Diego, Optics Letters **36**, 2429 (2011).
[51] N. Ortega-Quijano and J. L. Arce-Diego, Optics Letters **36**, 1942 (2011).
[52] R. Ossikovski, Optics Letters **36**, 2330 (2011).
[53] R. Ossikovski and O. Arteaga, Optics Letters **39**, 4470 (2014).
[54] A. G. Marinopoulos, L. Reining, A. Rubio, and N. Vast, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 046402 (2003).
[55] V. Devlaminck, P. Terrier, and J.-M. Charbois, Optics Letters **38**, 1410 (2013).
[56] V. Devlaminck, P. Terrier, and J.-M. Charbois, Optics Letters **38**, 1497 (2013).
[57] J. J. Gil and E. Bernabeu, Journal of Modern Optics **33**, 185 (1986).
[58] R. S. Cloude and E. Pottier, Optical Engineering **34**, 1599 (1995).
[59] M. Tomamichel, *Quantum Information Processing with Finite Resources: Mathematical Foundations*, Vol. 5 (Springer, 2015).
[60] See Supplemental Material at `http://???` for the full demonstration of Property 1.